UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,819	02/22/2002	Edward O. Clapper	ITL.0694US (P13225)	3076

21906 7590 07/06/2007

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631

EXAMINER	
ANWAH, OLISA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/081,819	CLAPPER, EDWARD O.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olisa Anwah	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-8,10-12,15-22,24,31-37 and 49-54* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9, 13, 14, 23, 25-30 and 38-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9, 13, 14, 23, 25-28, 39, 41-43 and 44-48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windsor et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,734,706 (hereinafter Windsor) combined with Suzuki, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027098 (hereinafter Suzuki).

Regarding claim 9, Windsor discloses a system comprising:

a first personal-use device that is separate from a telephone and a second personal-use device, the first personal-use device including a first interface to connect said first personal-use device to a telephone line and including a second interface to connect said first personal-use device to the second personal-use device, the first personal-use device (see Figure 1) having:

a processor;

a storage coupled to said processor to store a first database with a plurality of records, each containing a telephone number, a name, and other information; and

an application stored in said storage to enable said processor to, in response to the detection of an incoming call to said telephone (see When an incoming call is detected from column 3), automatically access the telephone number of a second party to an ongoing telephone call (see a signal is sent to the computing system from column 3), automatically search the first database for a record containing said telephone number (see The call information in the formatted signal is used as an index to a relational database from column 3), and automatically display (see Information in the database is then displayed on a display unit from column 3) a name, telephone number, and other information associated with said record on the first personal-use device, and in response to a request received on said first personal-use device (see at the click of a mouse from column 11), said processor to automatically display on said first personal-use device a predetermined set of extended associated with said second party (see additional information from column 12).

Further regarding claim 9, Windsor does not teach the first device is standalone and portable. Nevertheless, Suzuki cover these features (see Figure 1). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Windsor with the standalone and portable device of Suzuki. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by employing various communication terminals as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0026).

Regarding claim 13, nowhere does Windsor mention the storage to store a user preference table that indicates a preferred search hierarchy among a plurality of databases. All the same, Suzuki covers this feature (see paragraph 0072). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Windsor with the preference table of Suzuki. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing a search process to be specified in advance as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0072).

Regarding claim 14, see Figure 7C of Windsor.

Regarding claim 23, Windsor discloses a method comprising:

receiving in a device first information about a party called by using a telephone coupled to said device (see a signal is sent to the computing system from column 3);

automatically searching for second information associated with the party in response to receiving said first information (see The call information in the formatted signal is used as an index to a relational database from column 3);

in response to a request (see at the click of a mouse from column 11), automatically obtaining predetermined third information about the party from a personal computer coupled to said device;

providing the third information to the device from the personal computer to display (see basic viewing options from column 11) the information on the device during the telephone call.

Further regarding claim 23, Windsor does not teach the device is standalone, battery-powered and transportable. Nevertheless, Suzuki cover these features (see Figure 1). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Windsor with the standalone, battery-powered and transportable device of Suzuki. This modification would have improved the system's

flexibility by employing various communication terminals as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0026).

Regarding claim 25, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 26, see Figure 7D of Windsor.

Regarding claim 27, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 28, see Figure 7C of Windsor.

Regarding claim 39, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 41, see Figure 1 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 42, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 43, see column 3 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 44, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 45, see column 3 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 46, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 47, see column 11 of Windsor.

Regarding claim 48, Windsor does not teach the device is battery powered to enable transport of said first personal-use device while said first personal device is in operation. All the same Suzuki shows this feature (see Figure 1). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Windsor with the standalone, battery-powered and transportable device of Suzuki.

This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by employing various communication terminals as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0026).

3. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windsor combined with Suzuki in view of Brenner et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,206,593 (hereinafter Brenner).

Regarding claim 38, the combination of Windsor and Suzuki does not teach the a printer housed in the first personal-use device. All the same, Brenner covers this feature (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Windsor and Suzuki with the printer of Brenner. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing for directing printing of the information pertaining to each call as suggested by Windsor (see column 6).

4. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windsor combined with Suzuki in further view of Szlam et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,675,637 (hereinafter Szlam).

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Windsor and Suzuki does not show enabling a user to define a search path for said device to initiate a search of a plurality of remote sources for the information. All the same, Szlam discloses this limitation (see Figures 2A-J). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Windsor and Suzuki with a method of enabling a user to define a search path for said device to initiate a search of a plurality of remote sources for the information. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing a search process to be specified in advance as suggested by Suzuki (see paragraph 0072).

Regarding claim 30, although Windsor mentions the plurality of remote sources includes a remote service provider (see column 11), the combination of Windsor and Suzuki falls short of showing the plurality of remote sources includes the Internet. Regardless, Szlam discloses this limitation (see column 2). Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Windsor and Suzuki with the network of Szlam. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by connecting to information sources that may be

located in a different part of the country as suggested by Szlam (see column 10).

5. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windsor combined with Suzuki in further view of Whitney, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0013162 (hereinafter Whitney).

Regarding claim 40, nowhere does the combination of Windsor and Suzuki mention that the first personal use device is wirelessly connectable to the second personal-use device. All the same, Whitney shows this feature (see abstract). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Windsor and Suzuki with the modem of Whitney. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by providing a lightweight device as suggested by Whitney (see paragraph 0019).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be

reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

OA

Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
June 22, 2007

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600